

Appln. No. 10/623,253
Amendment dated November 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The August 23, 2006 Final Office Action and the Examiner's comments have been carefully considered. In response, an interview was conducted with Examiner Edmund Lee, claims are amended, and remarks are set forth below in a sincere effort to place the present application in form for allowance. The amendments are supported by the application as originally filed. Therefore, no new matter is added.

Inasmuch as the present amendment raises no new issues for consideration, and, in any event, places the present application in condition for allowance or in better condition for consideration on appeal, its entry under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.116 is respectfully requested.

INTERVIEW

The courtesy of Examiner Lee in granting and conducting an interview in connection with this application is acknowledged and appreciated. The interview took place on or about October 5, 2006. During the interview, the invention and cited references were discussed. In addition, proposed amendments to the claims

Appln. No. 10/623,253
Amendment dated November 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2006

were discussed with Examiner Lee to more clearly define the claimed invention over the references of record.

TITLE

The title of the invention is amended to be more clearly directed to the presently claimed invention.

PRIOR ART REJECTION

In the Office Action claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2000280756 A (Masuda et al.).

In response to the prior art rejection, claims 1 and 2 are amended to more clearly define the invention over the cited reference and all of the references of record. The claims now more clearly recite the method of producing the molded product of a weatherstrip previously recited in the claims.

Neither Masuda et al. nor any of the other references of record, when taken either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the steps of forming the molded product of a weatherstrip as now recited in claims 1 and 2.

It is recognized that previous claims 1 and 2 were directed to a product by process, and that the current claims are method claims. The amendment of claims 1 and 2 from product by process

Appln. No. 10/623,253
Amendment dated November 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2006

to method claims was discussed with Examiner Lee during the interview. Examiner Lee stated, after a lengthy discussion with Applicant's attorney, that he did not see the change in claims from product by process to a method as being equivalent to a shift in invention which would require the filing of a new application (i.e., continuation application).

It is respectfully submitted that no new issues are raised by the amendments, and therefore entry is proper under 37 CFR 1.116.

* * * * *


Entry of this Amendment under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.116, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out where there is support for a contrary view.

Appln. No. 10/623.253
Amendment dated November 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2006

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert P. Michal
Reg. No. 35,614

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. (212) 319-4900
Fax (212) 319-5101
RPM/ms